UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/719,389	06/25/2001	David Holliday	2365-105	8225

6449 7590 02/09/2007

ROTHWELL, FIGG, ERNST & MANBECK, P.C.
1425 K STREET, N.W.
SUITE 800
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER	
HOSSAIN, FARZANA E	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2623	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	02/09/2007	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Notice of this Office communication was sent electronically on the above-indicated "Notification Date" and has a shortened statutory period for reply of 3 MONTHS from 02/09/2007.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PTO-PAT-Email@rfem.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/719,389	HOLLIDAY ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Farzana E. Hossain	2623	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *20 November 2006*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-18 and 22-37* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-18 and 22-37* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *25 June 2001* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This action is in response to communications filed 11/20/2006. Claims 1, 7, 9-12 14, 16, 26-29 are amended. Claims 2, 15, 17 are original. Claims 3-6, 8, 13, 18, 22-25, 30-37 have been previously presented. Claims 19-21 are cancelled.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 11/20/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding Claim 1, the applicant argues that Chaney fails to disclose that the program information may be decompressed by identify corresponding text portions in a dictionary and whether the data blocks are dictionaries for decompression. The applicant argues that Chaney does not disclose receiving, storing and using two versions of the dictionary and that more than one version of the master program guide (MPG) is stored. The applicant argues that the MPG is not a dictionary that is used to decompress program schedule data. (Pages 10-11)

In response to the argument, the specification discloses that the dictionary is a look table with portions of text (Page 15, lines 17-19) and the decoder uses the text from the dictionary to reconstruct the full text of the page (Page 17, lines 4-7). Chaney

discloses a map or a look up table comprising text portions (Column 5, lines 25-62). Chaney discloses that the map is decoded or decompressed. Chaney discloses that data is encoded or compressed by the transmitter (Column 7, lines 31-49) and that data is transmitted to an appropriate decoder to decode the signal. It is necessarily included that data that is encoded and compressed at the transmitter should be decoded and decompressed, therefore, the master program guide data is decompressed or the dictionary is decompressed. The claim language states means for decompressing program schedule data not a dictionary that is used to decompress program schedule data. The claim language also disclose two versions of the dictionary is receivable by the receiver and storing one version of the dictionary, the claim language does not disclose storing two versions of the dictionary. Chaney discloses storing a version of the dictionary (Column 6, lines 36-67).

Regarding Claim 9, the applicant argues that Eyer does not disclose channel set and channel subset identities and that Eyer fails to disclose storing reference channel set identity and reference channel subset identity. Applicant argues that Eyer filters IPG data based on its assigned region and fails to disclose comparing the channel set and channel subset identities. (Page 11).

In response to the argument, Eyer discloses discarding any data that does not match the region of the channel set or channel subset for the specific IRD and passes all IPG data that is associated with the IPG region, or the IRD compares the channel set and channel subset identities to the reference channel set and channel subset identities

to determine if the received signal to output the signal for display (Column 7, lines 31-40, Column 8, lines 43-67). Also, Eyer discloses that the microprocessor can filter or compare the IPG data for channel set and channel subset identities (Column 9, lines 11-35). Therefore, Eyer discloses that an IPG filter compares reference identities for a channel set and a channel subset for each region.

Regarding Claim 14, the applicant argues that Schein teaches sorting the list in a time order but fails to disclose filtering the received scheduled data based on the received sorting list data and displays the filtered schedule and that Schein teaches in-situ sorting based upon user-selected them criteria (Page 12).

In response to the argument, the claim language discloses receiving sorting data defining a sorting list and scheduling data and that the receiver is being arranged to filter the schedule data depending on the sorting data. Schein discloses receiving a sorting data defining a sorting list and scheduling data defining a schedule of program events, which can include theme or video on demand or can include a program guide based on channels and time (Figures 16A and 16B). Schein discloses a sorting data defining a sorting list of the show information including scheduling data (Figure 4-9). Schein filters the lists based on the sorting data (Figure 19A, Figures 4-9). Schein filters the EPG with the sorting list data provided (Figures 4-9). Schein provides an index list sorted by time (Figure 6, Figure 16A). The examiner would like to point out that the claim language mentions filtering the scheduling data depending on sorting data. The

applicant is arguing details from the applicant's specification and these details are not disclosed in the claim limitations.

Regarding Claim 16, the applicant is arguing that Eyer fails to teach a first network that broadcasts program schedule data at a faster rate than a second network broadcasts program schedule data, a cache for storing the different data, mans for decoding the cache data and means for receiving additional program data. The applicant further argues that the program schedule data is broadcast over two networks (Pages 12-13).

In response to the argument, Eyer clearly discloses that the program schedule data is broadcast over the CATV network and the satellite network (Abstract, Figure 1). Also note, the claim limitations discloses the receiver comprising a cache store for storing a portion of the program schedule data for the first and/or the second network. The claim limitation does not state a cache for storing different data. Eyer discloses the first network broadcasts program schedule data at a faster rate (Figure 1, 180,Column 9, lines 45-50, 63-67, Column 10, lines 1-6, 36-62, Column 20, lines 66-67, Column 21, lines 1-7) and a cache store for storing a portion of program schedule data (Figure 1, 180,Column 9, lines 45-50, 63-67, Column 10, lines 1-6, 36-62) and receiving and decoding additional program data from the first network (Column 5, lines 62-67, Column 8, lines 25-28, Column 15, lines 32-37).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claim 1-4, 7, 8, 22-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Chaney (US 5,841,433).

Regarding Claim 1, Chaney discloses a receiver (Figure 6, 612) for receiving television (TV) signals in a plurality of channels each defining a television program (Figure 3) and at least a signal in one of the channels (Column 3, lines 55-67) comprising

compressed program schedule data defining broadcast events in the channels from time to time (Figures 5a-5b), the receiver being arranged to produce output signals defining an image of broadcast events in the program schedule for displaying on a TV screen (Figure 3) and comprising

means for receiving data defining a dictionary representing text portions or a map to represent text portions (Column 5, lines 42-50), means for decompressing the program scheduling data to identify text portions in the dictionary or means for constructing meaning of the program scheduling data by identifying corresponding text

portions of the dictionary or map (Figure 3, Column 5, lines 42-60, Column 7, lines 31-49, 59-67, Column 8, lines 1-5),

and means for constructing the image of events using identified corresponding text portions (Figure 3), wherein data defining two versions of the dictionary representing different text portions is receivable by the receiver (Column 6, lines 36-67),

the receiver comprising storing means for storing data defining one version of the dictionary (Column 6, lines 36-67) and

means for determining whether data corresponding to a text portion is in the stored version of the dictionary or the other version of the dictionary (Column 6, lines 36-67).

Regarding Claim 2, Chaney discloses all the limitations of Claim 1. Chaney discloses the text portions comprise an extended service description or information about the channel (Figures 5a (1, 2, 3), 5b).

Regarding Claim 3, Chaney discloses all the limitations of Claim 1. Chaney discloses the text portions comprise an event name or title (Figures 5a (1, 2, 3), Column 5, lines 45-50).

Regarding Claim 4, Chaney discloses all the limitations of Claim 1. Chaney discloses the text portions comprise a title, which is the name of an event, which reads on a short event name (Figures 5a (1, 2, 3), Column 5, lines 45-50). Note: the applicant does not define short event name.

Regarding Claim 7, Chaney discloses all the limitations of Claim 1. Chaney discloses means for receiving the data of the other version of the dictionary or the

newer/emergency version of the dictionary and means for replacing data of the one version of the dictionary or master guide data (Figure 5a and 5b) for the text portion is determined to be stored in the other version of the dictionary (Column 6, lines 36-67).

Regarding Claim 8, Chaney discloses all the limitations of Claim 1. Chaney discloses means for storing a default dictionary or master guide data (Column 6, lines 36-67).

Regarding Claim 22, Chaney discloses all the limitations of Claim 2. Chaney discloses the text portions comprise an event name or title (Figures 5a (1, 2, 3), Column 5, lines 45-50).

Regarding Claims 23, 24 and 25, Chaney discloses all the limitations of Claims 2, 3 and 22 respectively. Chaney discloses the text portions comprise a title, which is the name of an event, which reads on a short event name (Figures 5a (1, 2, 3), Column 5, lines 45-50). Note: the applicant does not define short event name.

5. Claims 9-11, 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Eyer et al (US 6,160,545 and hereafter referred to as "Eyer").

Regarding Claim 9, Eyer discloses a receiver for receiving TV signals in a plurality of channels each defining a television program and/or services provided by a broadcaster (Column 5, lines 54-61, Column 6, lines 26-32), and a channel set identity or region ID (Column 8, lines 7-10) and a channel subset identity or national indicator for the channel (Column 8, lines 5-6), the receiver comprising

means for storing a reference channel set identity or region ID or discarding all other channel map data (Column 6, lines 59-67) and one or more reference channel subset identities or channel map data (Figure 1, 185, Column 7, lines 46-50,) or channel map data is used to determine national services or regional services for the particular IRD for comparison with received data for global and regional sources (Column 8, lines 43-67, Figure 3, 300, 170).

means for comparing the channel set identify and channel subset identities in a received signal with reference channel set and channel subset identities (Column 7, lines 30-40, Figure 1, 165) and

means for outputting the receive TV signal for display of the program or other services defined thereby depending on the comparison (Column 7, lines 30-40, Figure 1, 195, Figure 3, 195).

Regarding Claim 10, Eyer discloses all the limitations of Claim 9. Eyer discloses storing means or RAM to store the common channel subset or national/global identifying programs and/or services receivable independent of the receivers location (Column 9, lines 43-52) and a regional channel subset identifying programs and/or other services receivable depending on the location of the receiver specific to a CATV network such as in a metropolitan area (Column 8, lines 53-60, lines 64-67).

Regarding Claims 11 and 26, Eyer discloses all the limitations of Claims 9 and 10 respectively. Eyer discloses that each channel has associated with it a logical channel number which varies on a channel subset basis or satellite channels depend on common data or global data (Column 9, lines 37-44) and region specific channel subset

such as different CATV networks in a region (Column 9, lines 37-44), the receiver comprising means for displaying a list of program and/or other services containing the logical channel number or services and programming for specific channels (Column 9, lines 37-44).

6. Claims 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Schein et al (US 2004/011745 and hereafter referred to as "Schein").

Regarding Claim 14, Schein discloses a receiver for receiving TV signals in a plurality of channels each defining a TV program (Figure 1, 12, Figure 2, 60, 62, 64) and wherein the signals comprise sorting data defining a sorting list (Figure 4-9) and scheduling data defining a schedule of program events (Figures 40-9, Page 6, paragraph 0067-0070, 0081-0086, Figures 16A, 16B) the receiver being arranged to filter the scheduling data depending on the sorting data (Figure 20A, Themes and Searches, Page 6, paragraph 0081-0086, Page 7, paragraph 0087-0095) to produce output signals defining an image of selected events in the program schedule for display as a filtered schedule on a TV screen depending on the sorting data (Figure 20A, Themes and Searches, Page 6, paragraph 0081-0086, Page 7, paragraph 0087-0095).

Regarding Claim 15, Schein discloses all the limitations of Claim 14. Schein disclose wherein the sorting data includes data to enable events in the schedule data to be selected for display in the filtered schedule depending on at least on of a genre or sub-genre (Figure 20A, Themes and Searches, Page 6, paragraph 0081-0086, Page 7, paragraph 0087-0095).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chaney in view of Eyer.

Regarding Claim 5, Chaney discloses all the limitations of Claim 1. Chaney is silent on the text portions comprise an extended event description. Eyer discloses IPG data or dictionary containing blocks of data for the program schedule with text portions comprise an extended event description or information about the program (Column 13, lines 58-67). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Chaney to include text portions comprise an extended event descriptions or information about the program (Column 5, lines 54-62, Column 9, lines 50-62) as taught by Eyer in order to limit the amount of information at the receiver by sending limited channel map information or dictionary with text portion to provide cost and bandwidth benefits for the receiver (Column 2, lines 62-67) as disclosed by Eyer.

9. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chaney in view of Allison et al (US 2005/0144638 and hereafter referred to as "Allison").

Regarding Claim 6, Chaney discloses all the limitations of Claim 1. Chaney discloses service map or dictionary with channel/program information and that the dictionary or map includes text portions with data including titles, ratings, channel information, and categories. Chaney is silent on the text portions comprise a special event message. Allison discloses the program guide includes special event messages such as special offer for an upcoming pay per view event (Page 5, paragraph 0059). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Chaney to include program guide comprising special event messages such as special offer for an upcoming pay per view event (Page 5, paragraph 0059) as taught by Allison in order to provide users with an interactive program guide which facilitates navigation and numerous options (Page 1, paragraph 0002-0005) as disclosed by Allison.

10. Claims 12, 27-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eyer in view of Klosterman (US 6,072,983).

Regarding Claims 12, 27, 28, 29, Eyer discloses all limitations of Claims 9, 10, 11 and 26 respectively. Eyer discloses a program guide or IPG that displays a list of programs and services (Column 5, lines 54-61). Eyer is silent on an order channel number, which varies on channel subset basis, the receiver comprising means for displaying a lit of programs and/or other services depending on the order channel number. Klosterman discloses receiving program schedule information, which is sorted in a predetermined order such that the program schedule is mixed, sorted, organized in

a format (Column 6, lines 11-27). It is necessarily included that if the there is a specific predetermined order in which the programming and services should be displayed that a number is associated with the order of the display. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Eyer to include an order number for receiving program schedule information which is sorted in a predetermined order such that the program schedule is mixed, sorted, organized in a format (Column 6, lines 11-27) as taught by Klosterman so that the program schedule is ready for immediate display and saves time (Column 6, lines 11-27) as disclosed by Klosterman.

11. Claims 13, 30, 31, 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eyer in view of Coleman et al (US 5,844,620 and hereafter referred to as "Coleman").

Regarding Claims 13, 30, 31, 33, Eyer discloses all limitations of Claims 9, 10, 11 and 26 respectively. Eyer is silent on each channel has associated with it one or more indicators, the receiver comprising means responsive to the indicators for controlling display of program and/or service information. Coleman discloses that each channel has associated with it one or more indicators such as closed captions (Column 3, lines 54-60, Column 19, lines 8-27) theme categories (Column 4, lines 1-4) and rating/parental rating (Column 3, lines, 63-67, Column 4, lines 5-12, Column 22, lines 51-54), the receiver comprising means responsive to the indicator for controlling display of program as parental controls on the program (Column 3, lines, 63-67, Column 4, lines

5-12, Column 22, lines 51-54) or to display closed captioning (Column 3, lines 54-60, Column 19, lines 8-27). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Eyer to include that each channel has associated with it one or more indicators such as closed captions (Column 3, lines 54-60, Column 19, lines 8-27) theme categories (Column 4, lines 1-4) and rating/parental rating (Column 3, lines, 63-67, Column 4, lines 5-12, Column 22, lines 51-54), the receiver comprising means responsive to the indicator for controlling display of program as parental controls on the program (Column 3, lines, 63-67, Column 4, lines 5-12, Column 22, lines 51-54) or to display closed captioning (Column 3, lines 54-60, Column 19, lines 8-27) as taught by Coleman in order to allow a user to obtain information relating to the provision of services over a network (Column 1, lines 10-15) as disclosed by Coleman.

12. Claims 16-18, 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hofmann (US 5,883,677) in view of Eyer.

Regarding Claim 16, Hofmann discloses a receiver for receiving TV signals in a first plurality of channels broadcast in a first broadcast network and including program schedule data for the first network (Figure 1, 318, Figure 4B, 318) and TV signals in a second plurality of channels broadcast in a second broadcast network and including program schedule data for the second network (Figure 1, 314 Figure 4B, 310). Hofmann discloses a cache store for the program schedule data (Figure 4B). Hofmann is silent on the program schedule data being broadcast in one network at a faster rate

than in the other network, the receiver comprising a cache store for storing a portion of program schedule data for the first and/or the second network transmitted from time to time in at least one of the channels broadcast in the first network and /or the second network, means for decoding the data in the cache store for display of a program scheduled of the first or second broadcast network and means for receiving and decoding additional program schedule data from the first network for either the first or second broadcast network.

Eyer discloses that TV signals are broadcast via the first network or satellite network with program schedule or guide data (Figure 1, Column 3, lines 58-65) and TV signals are transmitted via second network or terrestrial/cable networks (Column 3, lines 58-65). Eyer discloses that the interactive program guide (IPG) is being broadcast over the satellite network. Eyer discloses data being broadcast in one network at a faster rate than in the other network, the receiver comprising a cache store for storing a portion of program schedule data (Figure 1, 180, Column 9, lines 45-50, 63-67, Column 10, lines 1-6, 36-62, Column 20, lines 66-67, Column 21, lines 1-7) for the first and/or the second network transmitted from time to time in at least one of the channels broadcast in the first network and/or the second network (Figure 1), means for decoding the data in the cache store for display of a program scheduled of the first or second broadcast network or constructing the data into an IPG (Figure 1, Figure 3, Column 9, lines 50-62) means for receiving and decoding additional program schedule data from the first network for either the first or second broadcast network (Column 13, lines 58-67, Column 5, lines 62-67, Column 8, lines 25-28, Column 15, lines 32-37).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Hofmann to include data being broadcast in one network at a faster rate than in the other network, the receiver comprising a cache store for storing a portion of program schedule data (Figure 1, 180, Column 9, lines 45-50, 63-67, Column 10, lines 1-6, 36-62, Column 20, lines 66-67, Column 21, lines 1-7) for the first and/or the second network transmitted from time to time in at least one of the channels broadcast in the first network and /or the second network (Figure 1), means for decoding the data in the cache store for display of a program scheduled of the first or second broadcast network or constructing the data into an IPG (Figure 1, Figure 3, Column 9, lines 50-62) and means for receiving and decoding additional program schedule data from the signals for the network (Column 13, lines 58-67, Column 5, lines 62-67, Column 8, lines 25-28, Column 15, lines 32-37) as taught by Eyer in order to provide cost and bandwidth benefits for the receiver (Column 2, lines 62-67) as disclosed by Eyer.

Regarding Claim 17, Hofmann and Eyer disclose all the limitations of Claim 16. Eyer discloses the cache store is updated when new data is transmitted in the first broadcast network or when the amount of time of IPG data can be stored such as the current 24 hours, which inherently includes that the cache store is updated with new data (Column 9, lines 21-24, 37-44, Column 10, lines 4-6).

Regarding Claims 18 and 37, Hofmann and Eyer disclose all the limitations of Claims 16 and 17 respectively. Eyer discloses the broadcast program schedule data comprises depth data for specific models of receiver via the preformatted blocks of IPG

data for daily schedules and title records (Column 11, lines 8-18), the receiver being arranged to receive depth data or receiving messages pertaining to and the amount of data that should be stored specifically schedule and title and/or descriptions in the cache store or RAM and this is dependent on the depth data or message to store as there are receivers without large enough storages to hold descriptions (Column 11, lines 26-33). The messages sent from the transmitted side is so that sorting and processing is performed only once at the transmitter versus at every decoder and also so that memory management is simplified (Column 11, lines 8-18).

13. Claim 32, 34-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eyer in view of Klosterman as applied to claims 12, 27-29 above, and further in view of Coleman.

Regarding Claims 32, 34, 35, 36, Eyer and Klosterman disclose all limitations of Claims 12, 27, 28, and 29 respectively. Eyer and Klosterman are silent on each channel has associated with it one or more indicators, the receiver comprising means responsive to the indicators for controlling display of program and/or service information. Coleman discloses that each channel has associated with it one or more indicators such as closed captions (Column 3, lines 54-60, Column 19, lines 8-27) theme categories (Column 4, lines 1-4) and rating/parental rating (Column 3, lines, 63-67, Column 4, lines 5-12, Column 22, lines 51-54), the receiver comprising means responsive to the indicator for controlling display of program as parental controls on the program (Column 3, lines, 63-67, Column 4, lines 5-12, Column 22, lines 51-54) or to

display closed captioning (Column 3, lines 54-60, Column 19, lines 8-27). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Eyer in view of Klosterman to include that each channel has associated with it one or more indicators such as closed captions (Column 3, lines 54-60, Column 19, lines 8-27) theme categories (Column 4, lines 1-4) and rating/parental rating (Column 3, lines, 63-67, Column 4, lines 5-12, Column 22, lines 51-54), the receiver comprising means responsive to the indicator for controlling display of program as parental controls on the program (Column 3, lines, 63-67, Column 4, lines 5-12, Column 22, lines 51-54) or to display closed captioning (Column 3, lines 54-60, Column 19, lines 8-27) as taught by Coleman in order to allow a user to obtain information relating to the provision of services over a network (Column 1, lines 10-15) as disclosed by Coleman.

Conclusion

14. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Farzana E. Hossain whose telephone number is 571-272-5943. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday 8:00 am to 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christopher Kelley can be reached on 571-272-7331. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

FEH
January 31, 2007

CHRIS KELLEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600